

TDC Blue Ribbon Committee

September 5, 2007 Meeting Minutes Final

Members Present: ECOSLO- Maria Lorca; Sierra Club – Susan Harvey; Templeton Area Advisory Group – Nicholas Marquart; Active Agriculturalist – Charles Whitney; Subdivision Review Board, Public Works – Richard Marshall; General Public – Melissa Boggs; General Public - Christine Volbrecht; Ag Liaison – Mark Pearce; Subdivision Review Board, Air Pollution Control Board – Aeron Arlin Genet; Farm Bureau – Joy Fitzhugh; City of San Luis Obispo – Kim Murry; South County Advisory Council - Jesse Hill

Members Absent: Land Conservancy – “BK” Bruce Richard; Development Firm – Denis Sullivan; City of Paso Robles- Ron Whisenand; Existing TDC receiver site – Chad Wittstrom

Committee Staff Present: Karen Nall and Kami Griffin, Planning and Building

Others Present: Dorothy Jennings, Sue Luft, Bob Hill- Land Conservancy

Richard Marshall opens the meeting.

New Business: Richard Marshall requests discussion of new business for items to be added to future agenda. Jesse Hill suggests placing a discussion of receiver sites on a future agenda. Kami Griffin announces that Rick Pruetz will be providing a presentation to the group at the next meeting on September 19, 2007.

Discussion: Report of July 17, 2007 BOS Meeting Annual /Status Report

Karen Nall provides overview of the discussion that occurred. Melissa Boggs questions whether the newspaper article regarding the Board meeting will be included in the discussion. Karen Nall notes that she will provide the comments given by the Board members which were included in the newspaper article. Karen Nall provides the following comments from the July 17, 2007 Board meeting: Supervisor Gibson expressed concern for the deliberate pace of the committee, was concerned that the committee did not look at the program as a whole and encouraged the participation of the cities. Supervisor Patterson noted that the lack of receiver sites has “hog tied” the program. Supervisor Ovitt was concerned that the committee is given enough time to develop a white paper. Karen Nall notes that no specific direction was provided by the Board. Discussion ensues regarding the comments received and the remaining one year time frame to develop the final report. Kami Griffin notes that we will need time to develop the report and run it through the committee. Chris Volbrecht is not sure she is clear of where the committee is heading at this point. Jesse Hill questions how and where the changes will be made to the LUO. Kami Griffin responds that we may go forward with the broad concept not exact LUO language. Sue Harvey questions whether the committee would support radical changes. Maria Lorca notes that she heard Supervisor Gibson encourage the group to set aside the current ordinance and come up with new concepts. She also questions whether we would be able to hire Bull Fulton to review our concepts and critique them. Aeron Arlin Genet likes the idea of hiring a third party. Melissa Boggs thinks the Committee should try to agree on the big concepts. Charlie Whitney questioned if the Committee could reconvene later to help with the details, e.g., re-drafting County ordinance. Kami Griffin responds that she will make sure the committee is kept informed. Kim Murry would like to give as much detailed direction as possible. Sue Harvey would like to see input from the cities. Kim Murry notes that the City of SLO has identified sending sites of interest to it and Paso Robles has identified the purple belt areas. She adds that the cities will be looking at ways to retire the densities in these areas. She adds that this committee can not really help with these City details. Charlie Whitney notes that there is already cooperation ongoing between the cities and landowners within the county. Kim Murry responds that there is policy support for the TDC program but for the City of SLO there are no formal procedures in place. She adds that there is a formal City and County MOU for development on the fringes. Charlie Whitney questions whether LAFCo can be involved. Group agrees LAFCo may be a good organization to help. Discussion returns to the annual report and Board meeting. Melissa Boggs notes that the newspaper article included the comments made by Karen Nall. Charlie Whitney feels that

some of the Board comments were unfair and notes that he believes there are members of the committee that provided testimony to the Board and who are responsible for delaying the committee's progress. Maria Lorca asked for clarification of the number of lots created by the program since the number in the annual report to the Board is about twice what we had calculated before. Karen Nall and Kami Griffin clarify the numbers reported. Melissa Boggs feels that discussing these fine details actually wastes the committee time and does not allow the committee to look at the big picture. Richard Marshall requests public comment on this item. Dorothy Jennings notes that she believes that the draft report should have gone to the committee first. Dorothy Jennings makes the following comments on the report: Page F1-2 number of acres provided on sending sites but no clarifying language is presented, Page 3 notes items which were withdrawn languages should be added for why these items were withdrawn, Page 4 statement 1 and statement 5 are not correct and that the report should be written so that the public can understand. Sue Luft encourages the group to watch the video and provides Supervisor's Gibson comments.

Discussion: General Discussion on information from past presentations

Richard Marshall begins the discussion and notes that the committee has a choice at this point to either wrap up sending sites or move on to receiving sites. He suggests going around the table. Richard Marshall notes he is on the fence and would like to wrap up sending sites but would also like to begin some new discussion on the new ideas presented at the last couple of meetings. Sue Harvey would like to wait to hear from the next couple of speakers and continue discussing the big picture items. Kim Murry would like to wrap up sending sites; she would like closure and would like the committee to identify what we would like to save. Maria Lorca would like to define the program goals and define what we would like to save. Mark Pearce would like to wrap up so that we can move forward. Bob Hill notes that he will contact Michael Bell and notes that the Land Conservancy would like to know if the committee is interested in endorsing the Land Bank concept. Chris Volbrecht is not in favor of wrapping up the sending sites discussion because she feels we have not come up with any idea to encourage new sending sites. Melissa Boggs suggests that we postpone the sending site discussion and refocus on the overall program goals which will enable more brainstorming. Joy Fitzhugh notes that there must be incentives for both sending and receiving sites. Nick Marquart wants to leave the door open on sending sites but would like to move ahead. Aeron Arlin Genet would like to move ahead but does not want to lose sending information and consensuses reached. Jesse Hill agrees and thought it was interesting that antiquated subdivisions may not be such a problem. Charlie Whitney notes that he thought the presentations were well done. He would like to endorse the Land Banking concept but would like to keep both options open. He agrees that we will have to define what should be saved. He would like to temporarily shelve sending sites at the next meeting and move on the receiving sites. Richard Marshall concludes that wrapping up sending sites was not the first priority for the committee and that the other options are to move to receiving sites or to move to other big picture items including land banking. Richard Marshall requests public comment on this item. Dorothy Jennings notes that this is a learning process and that the group needs to revisit the uses allowed for natural resources sending sites. Sue Luft encourages the group to look at land banking. Charlie Whitney makes a motion to pause the sending site discussion following the next regular meeting and discuss land banking at the following meeting. Joy Fitzhugh seconds the motion. Chris Volbrecht believes the group needs to discuss receiving sites prior to land banking. Charlie Whitney believes the land banking concept can resolve problems associated with receiving sites. Joy Fitzhugh notes that land banking and receiving sites are related. Kim Murry sees land banking as a mechanism or tool to achieve the sending and receiving sites. Richard Marshall agrees that land banking is a separate concept. Charlie Whitney believes that land banking could be more acceptable to the public and may be used for GPA's and parking waivers. Kim Murry notes that the receiver site definition needs to be broadened to include uses other than creating lots. Charlie Whitney amends the motion to pause sending sites today and to look at receiving sites in the wide spectrum including but not limited to the "Givings Principle", and land banking. Joy Fitzhugh seconded changes to the motion. Kami Griffin suggests providing the group the original program purpose goals. Richard

Marshall suggests that we should not go in this direction because we may lose momentum. Aeron Arlin Genet would like to see it but at a later date. Kim Murry would like a discussion about what we are saving because she feels that following BK's presentation, protection of antiquated subdivisions may not be a large part of the program goals. Sue Harvey would like to invite Bob Hill to attend future meetings. Bob Hill responds that he is available to assist the group. Jesse Hill notes that he has not heard any different things to protect than what was discussed during the discussion for the initial program. Richard Marshall notes that he believes that we should not prioritize saving lands that are very remote because they are not as vulnerable to development, and that we should prioritize protecting lands that are further connected to urban areas. Kami Griffin points out that this will create a leap frog growth pattern. Karen Nall notes that the term BK used was to create regions of interest. Joy Fitzhugh notes that there are other tools for conservation. Bob Hill notes that he would like to point out that sending sites may have a combination of agriculture, natural resources, and underlying lots and that they are site specific. He adds that the program needs to have projects that have the "see, smell, touch test" so that the community can be supportive. Richard Marshall restates the motion to pause sending sites today and to look at receiving sites in the wide spectrum including but not limited to the "Givings Principle" and land banking at the next regular meeting. Motion passes unanimously.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes from July 25, 2007 meetings and August 8, 2007 are approved.

Public Comment for items not on the agenda: Dorothy Jennings notes that Natural Areas (NA) plan is referred to in the Ag and Open Space Plan and that is different then the natural areas referred to for sending sites designation in the TDC ordinance.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting – September 19, 2007 at 3:00.